Application No.: 10/568,699

Attorney Docket No.: 2003M091

Response to Final Office Action dated December 23, 2008

Amendment dated February 20, 2009

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claim 10 is amended to particularly point out the sequence of steps, to set forth that there is no step of stripping to remove alcohol between steps (ii) and (iii), and to require that the absorbent is activated carbon, all supported by the original specification.

Other claims are amended to be consistent with the amendment to Claim 10 and/or to remove issues for Appeal.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments raise no new issues, in particular since the Examiner pointed out in the Final Action, referred to on the introductory page, that at least part of Applicant's arguments presented in the previous Official Action were not persuasive because the method recited was not closed to removal of alcohol between steps (ii) and (iii). In addition, the limitation of the absorbent to activated carbon was previously present in more than one dependent claims.

The amendments are believed to accomplish what was desired by the Examiner and even more, to be particularly directed to narrowing to the scope of the claims to be more consistent with the unexpected results shown in the present specification, and place the case clearly in condition for allowance without undue additional consideration by the Examiner.

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the amendments be entered.

Application No.: 10/568,699

Attorney Docket No.: 2003M091

Response to Final Office Action dated December 23, 2008

Amendment dated February 20, 2009

REMARKS

Claims 10-12, 15-21, 23-24, 26-29 are pending in the application.

The previous claims were rejected over Godwin et al. (U.S. 4,543,420) in view of Schlosberg et al. (U.S. 5,798,319) and also over Ageishi et al. (5,880,310) in view of the same Schlosberg et al.

The amended claims, set forth above, are now narrowly focused on the unexpected results achieved by use of activated carbon (as the absorbent) in combination with the step of filtering prior to stripping of excess alcohol.

Neither Godwin et al. nor Schlosberg et al., nor Ageishi et al., alone or taken together in any combination, teach the use of activated carbon and filtering prior to stripping of excess alcohol. This sequence of steps achieves the unexpected results demonstrated in the experiments set forth in the present specification.

For these reasons, it is respectfully urged that the present application is in condition for allowance, and early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

20 February 2009

/Andrew B. Griffis/

Date

Andrew B. Griffis Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 36,336

Post Office Address (to which all correspondence should be sent):

ExxonMobil Chemical Co.

Law Technology P.O. Box 2149

Baytown, Texas 77522-2149

Phone: 281-834-1886 281-834-2495 Fax: